UCLA Faculty Association

News and opinion from Dan Mitchell since 2009

Wednesday, July 23, 2025

Summary

UCOP has summarized the provisions of the federal legislation signed on July 4th as they relate to UC:

Final Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Reconciliation Legislation Summary

Background

On July 1, by a vote of 51-50, the U.S. Senate passed H.R. 1, the final budget reconciliation legislation bill, which was then sent to the U.S. House of Representatives, where it passed by a vote of 218-214, on July 3, allowing the bill to be sent to the President to be signed into law. You can find UC's July 1 letter to the California House delegation urging them to oppose the final bill and raising concerns over the impact of the legislation on the University community here.*

===

*https://ucop.app.box.com/s/r14gmcu2v61pzqp0eawn05ck16l50hcn

===

Final passage of the bill follows months of debate and was preceded by passage in the House of an earlier version of H.R. 1 on May 22, 2025 by a vote of 215-214. You can find UC's letter to the California House delegation outlining concerns in the initial House-passed bill here.**

===

**https://www.ucop.edu/federal-governmental-relations/_files/budget/20250520-reconciliation-bill-letter.pdf

===

In addition to extending the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, the bill makes significant cuts to student financial aid, Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and makes changes to the U.S. Tax Code that impact public and nonprofit institutions. Below is a summary of the final reconciliation legislation as it relates to UC.

Education Provisions

The final bill includes a number of provisions of concern to UC that would reduce access to higher education for students and make college less affordable, including:

• Pell Grants (Sec. 83004): The bill includes a provision that would make students who receive grants or scholarships covering their entire cost of attendance (COA) ineligible to receive a Pell Grant, even if otherwise eligible for the program.

• Borrowing Limits for Undergraduate and Graduate Students (Sec. 81001):

o Undergraduate Loan Limits: The bill maintains current limits for annual and aggregate borrowing.

o Graduate Loan Limits: The bill caps annual loan limits at $20,500 for graduate students and $50,000 for professional students. The aggregate limit would be capped at $100,000 for graduate students and $200,000 for professional students.

• Parent PLUS Loan Program (Sec. 81001): The bill includes new Parent PLUS loan limits restrictions: a $20,000 per year cap per dependent student and a $65,000 aggregate limit per dependent student (without regard to amounts forgiven, repaid, canceled or discharged).

• Student Loan Repayment Plans (Sec. 82001): The bill eliminates nearly all repayment plans for new borrowers and replaces them with a standard payment and a new income-based "Repayment Assistance Program." However, borrowers under the existing REPAYE or the Biden-era SAVE plan would be able to remain on their current repayment plan until July 1, 2028.

• Risk-Sharing (Sec. 84001): The bill creates an accountability measure for institutions of higher education. Specifically, the provision compares median earnings of cohorts of students who have exited the program within a certain timeframe, depending on the credential level, against the earnings of high school or bachelor's degree graduates, depending on the program credential level. Similar to the Gainful Employment framework, programs failing to meet this earnings threshold in two of three years would lose eligibility to participate in the Direct Loan

The Council of UC Faculty Associations

- Faculty leaders comment on UCB Chancellor Lyon's appearance before House Committee on Education and the Workforce
- CUCFA Opposes AB 715
- Pause Trellix and Form a Working Group to Explore Cybersecurity Solutions
- Objection to AB 1217, AB 684, and AB 500 – Protecting UC's Institutional Autonomy
- Delay the UC cybersecurity mandate

Remaking the University

- Liner Note 34: Derailing the Columbia Precedent - 7/27/2025
- The onto-epistemic limits of current American academic debates, Or what the modern West can't think (Guest Post) - 7/25/2025
- Liner Note 33. Trouble at the Irvine Core (UC Irvine Part 2) - 7/12/2025

Higher Ed. News & Commentary

- Chronicle of Higher Education
- Inside Higher Education
- Remaking the University
- Changing Universities
- California Professor

Search This Blog

Search

UC Faculty Associations

- UCLA Faculty Association
- UCSB Faculty Association
- UCSC Faculty Association
- UCB Faculty Association
- Council of UC Faculty Associations

Other Faculty Organizations

- American Association of University Professors
- California Faculty Association (NEA)
- UC-AFT

Topics

politics (2052) UC (2001) UC Regents (1832) health care (1384) State Budget (1256) governor (1093) UC budget crisis (953) UC-Berkeley (885) diversity (817) pension (655) pensions (589) tuition (523) admissions (516) athletics (501) CSU (399) transportation (383) UC-Davis (373) online education (337)

Program for two years. After one year of failure, institutions would have to provide disclosures to students.

• Grad PLUS Loan Program (Sec. 81001): The bill eliminates the Grad PLUS Loan program.

• Deregulation (Sec. 85001): The bill would revert the Borrower Defense and Closed School Discharge regulations to those in place prior to promulgation of regulations by the Biden administration but does not prohibit further rulemaking on the topics. The bill would also prohibit the secretary of education from promulgating any regulation or taking any executive action that is economically significant and results in a subsidy cost to the government.

Health Care Provisions

The final bill includes a number of provisions that change current law related to Medicaid and Medicare reimbursement:

• Lowering Limits on Medicaid State-Directed Payments (SDPs) (Sec. 71116): The bill caps new Medicaid SDPs at Medicare rates in Affordable Care Act (ACA) Medicaid expansion states like California. The bill includes grandfathering for existing state-directed payments submitted or approved prior to the bill but requires the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to reduce grandfathered SDPs by 10 percentage point per year starting in 2028 until they reach Medicare rates.

• Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) Cut for Utilization of Emergency Medicaid by Undocumented Individuals (Sec. 71110): The bill cuts the FMAP paid for services provided to undocumented individuals through the Emergency Medicaid program from the ACA adult expansion FMAP to the state's traditional Medicaid FMAP.

In California this would result in a cut from 90% to 50% federal match for undocumented individuals not covered by the state-only program for those with unsatisfactory immigration status.

• Lowering Limits on Medicaid Provider Taxes and Changing Existing Uniformity Requirements (Sec. 71115, 71117): Currently, states are allowed to tax health care providers for up to 6% of net patient revenue to fund the non-federal share of Medicaid payments. The bill would gradually reduce the 6% limit by 0.5% per year starting in 2028 until it reached 3.5% in 2032. The bill also contains a provision that alters how CMS calculates whether a provider tax meets existing uniformity requirements. The provision is likely to cause challenges for several Medicaid financing mechanisms in California including the Hospital Quality Assurance Fee and the Managed Care Organization Tax.

The provision takes effect immediately but gives the secretary discretion to offer up to three years of transition.

• Restrictions on Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment (Sec. 71119, 71107, 71120): The bill puts significant new bureaucratic barriers in place for Medicaid-eligible patients seeking health insurance—including requiring states to establish new "community engagement requirements" (also known as work requirements) by Dec. 31, 2026. The bill also requires more frequent eligibility redetermination for states (now every six months), and new cost sharing provisions starting Oct 1, 2028 for Medicaid beneficiaries with incomes greater than 100% of poverty. These hurdles are likely to result in many Californians who should be covered by Medicaid losing their health care coverage due to technicalities and financial burdens they are unable to meet.

• Rural Health Transformation Program (Sec. 71401): The bill includes $50 billion for a Rural Health Transformation Program. Over the next five years, CMS will distribute $10 billion per year to states to support rural health transformation projects. Half the funds would be split evenly by state, the other half determined by the CMS administrator based on a number of factors related to rural health care. California would likely be eligible to receive $100 million under the program in each of the next five years under the bill. The state would need to submit an application to CMS to receive the funds. CMS decisions for first year funding are required by Dec. 31, 2025.

• Modification of cuts to the Medicare Physician Fee Schedule (Sec. 71202): The bill includes a temporary patch to the Medicare physician fee schedule to increase payments by 2.5% in 2026.

Tax Provisions

The bill includes changes to the U.S. Tax Code that could impact UC, including the following provisions:

• Expanding the Tax on Executive Compensation within Tax-Exempt Organizations (Sec. 70416): This provision expands the excise tax on employees within tax-exempt organizations earning over $1,000,000 per year. This change will impose new tax liabilities on UC and will adversely impact the University's ability to recruit and retain leaders and top-level professionals. This provision applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

• Termination and Restrictions on Clean Electricity Investment Credit (Sec. 70513):

This provision phases out the clean electricity investment credit at various phases depending on the technology involved. The provision phases out investments in wind and solar energy for any qualified property placed in service by the taxpayer after Dec. 31, 2027, which is part of an applicable facility, which disincentives important investments in clean energy. Restrictions on material assistance being provided by prohibited foreign entities are included. Additional restrictions are included on energy storage technologies and other technology areas. UC has invested significant resources to utilize these critical investments in energy infrastructure for energy efficiency and cost savings, such as investments in solar, batteries, microgrids and other energy technologies. The repeal of this credit removes one of the financing mechanisms available to support these investments.

• Termination and Restrictions on Clean Electricity Production Credit (Sec. 70512):

UCOP (299) ucrp (298) uc retirement (296) audio (291) traffic (287) new hotel-conference center (282) UC enrollment (279) enrollment (253) UC-San Diego (250) community colleges (234) LAO (222) UC-Irvine (182) fund raising (163) UC-San Francisco (155) UC-Santa Barbara (155) UC-Santa Cruz (154) controller (144) faculty center (141) UC-Riverside (137) ballot propositions (132) CalPERS (120) UC-Merced (110) faculty pay (109) Master Plan (102) Yudof (89) UCRS retirement (62) Faculty Association at UCLA (59) parking (59) privatization (59) CalSTRS (50) UC Berkeley (34) copyright (31) campus climate survey (28) UCRS (21) Michigan Model (18) UC Merced (17) uc funding (16) State Contribution (14) UCOF (14) Regents (13) faculty recruitment (12) UC pay (7) graduate education (6) UC San Diego (5) UC Irvine (3) UCpolitics (3) teaching evaluation (3) UC Santa Cruz (2)

Blog Archive

▼ 2025 (612)
- ▼ August (9)
  - NSF Fund Suspensions
  - Frankel Case Settles for Well Over $6 Million - Pa...
  - Straws in the Wind - Part 58
  - UCAD
  - Double D-Day (Deadline Decision)
  - New UCLA Police Chief
  - Straws in the Wind - Part 57
  - Fund Suspension
  - The Memo
- ► July (101)
- ► June (96)
- ► May (85)
- ► April (81)
- ► March (83)
- ► February (76)
- ► January (81)

► 2024 (832)
► 2023 (828)
► 2022 (719)
► 2021 (710)
► 2020 (914)
► 2019 (671)
► 2018 (595)
► 2017 (666)
► 2016 (715)
► 2015 (765)
► 2014 (704)
► 2013 (776)
► 2012 (839)
► 2011 (738)
► 2010 (431)
► 2009 (12)

Contributors

- California Policy Issues
- Toby Higbie
- UCLA Faculty Association

This section terminates the clean electricity production tax credit for wind and solar facilities placed into service after Dec. 31, 2027. A provision in the bill also restricts material assistance from prohibited foreign entities.

• Termination of Energy Efficient Commercial Buildings Deduction (Sec. 70507): This section phases out Section 179D of the tax code, which is an energy tax incentive that has contributed towards the construction and design of energy efficient buildings.

Removing this provision will eliminate one of the tax incentives that has helped to provide cost savings for making investments in the construction and design of energy efficient buildings at UC. Section 179D will not be available for any property where the construction begins after June 30, 2026.

• 0.5% Floor on Deduction of Charitable Contributions by Individuals who Itemize (Sec. 70425): This provision requires taxpayers to meet a floor of at least 0.5% in charitable donations of their total income, before qualifying to deduct charitable giving from their itemized tax returns. The effective date for this provision applies to tax years beginning after Dec. 31, 2025.

• Permanent Deduction for Charitable Contributions by Individuals who do not Itemize (Sec. 70424): This provision allows individuals who do not itemize their tax returns to take a charitable giving deduction of up to $1,000 in donations for single tax filers and $2,000 for married filing jointly for tax years beginning after Dec. 31, 2025.

This provision is a significant improvement over current law that will encourage charitable giving to universities and other non-profits from the 93% of Americans who take the standard deduction.

• Additional Expenses Treated as Qualified Higher Education Expenses for Purposes of 529 Accounts (Sec. 70413): This provision expands the types of expenses that 529 education savings accounts can be used to pay for to include additional qualified higher education expenses.

• 1% Floor on Deduction of Charitable Contributions by Corporations (Sec. 70426):

This provision would require corporations to make at least 1% of its income in charitable contributions prior to being able to deduct such donations from their tax returns. The effective date begins for tax years after Dec. 31, 2025.

• Exclusion for Employer Payments of Student Loans (Sec. 70412): This provision makes permanent and indexes for inflation Section 127, the provision in existing tax law that allows employees to receive up to $5,250 in educational assistance from their employer. The effective date applies to payments in tax years after Dec. 31, 2025.

Agriculture and SNAP Provisions

The bill includes changes that could impact UC, including the following provisions:

• National Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program (Sec.10107): This section eliminates funding for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Education (SNAP-Ed) after federal fiscal year (FY) 2025. SNAP-Ed provides critical nutrition education services throughout the nation. In California, the UC-based SNAP-Ed Cal Fresh Healthy Living program provides SNAP-Ed nutrition education services in 34 counties via the UC Cooperative Extension.

• Matching Funds Requirements (Sec. 10105): This section makes changes to SNAP to require states to provide a cost-share match to the federal government based on the state's payment error rate for processing benefits. The bill includes an exemption from the cost-share requirement if a state has a less than 6% error rate. The new state-cost share match requirement could impose significant budgetary pressures on states, including California, that could make it more difficult for college students and their families facing food insecurity to receive SNAP benefits. States will be required to begin paying any cost-share rate that applies in FY 2028. For FY 2028, states will be able to choose the applicable matching funds rate based on the state's error rate in FY 2025 or FY 2026. However, starting in FY 2029, the state's responsibility will be calculated using the payment error rate averaged from the three prior years.

• Modifications to SNAP Work Requirements for Able-Bodied Adults (Sec. 10102): This section makes changes to the SNAP program that limit the availability of exceptions for individuals from meeting SNAP work requirements. SNAP work requirements will be generally applicable to individuals between the ages of 18-65 with a few exceptions. Exceptions include a parent or other member of a household with responsibility for a dependent child under 14 years of age; a pregnant woman; if a person is medically certified as physically or mentally unfit for employment; and certain other narrow exceptions. This section could make it more difficult for low-income college students and their families to continue to access SNAP benefits.

• Research (Sec. 10604): The bill provides funding to carry out several important programs:

o Urban, Indoor, and Other Emerging Agriculture Production, Research Education, and Extension Initiative;

o Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research;

o Specialty Crop Research Initiative;

o The Research Facilities Act; and

o Emergency Citrus Disease research and Development Trust Fund (Sec. 10607 Miscellaneous)

Defense Provisions

The bill includes $250 million for quantum research and $250 million for Artificial Intelligence (AI) research at the Department of Defense.

===

Source: https://ucop.app.box.com/s/66gz87iffjnirpohusrz67s2nmcvosqe.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:30 AM No comments:

Labels: pol, UC, UCOP

Straws in the Wind - Part 48

From State News: *Michigan State University has quietly removed references to diversity, equity and inclusion, or DEI, from its 2030 Strategic Plan website and several other public-facing pages. The changes include updates to pages for the College of Human Medicine, the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the DEI plan previously posted on the Office of the President's website. The University Outreach and Engagement Plan has also been removed from MSU's website.*

In statements to The State News, Amber McCann, university spokesperson and Diversity and Inclusion Communications Manager Henry Mochida both said MSU is conducting "an ongoing review of its 2030 Strategic Plan" and is also "engaged in an ongoing review of programs and activities in compliance with civil rights laws." ...

Full story at https://statenews.com/article/2025/07/msu-removes-dei-language-from-websites-amid-strategic-plan-review.

From The Hill via Yahoo News: *The Education Department announced on Thursday a civil rights investigation against George Mason University over allegations of discrimination regarding its diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) policies. The federal agency said multiple professors at the university alleged leadership is giving preferential treatment to underrepresented minority groups for hiring and promotion considerations among faculty.*

"Despite the leadership of George Mason University claiming that it does not discriminate on the basis of race, it appears that its hiring and promotion policies and practices from 2020 to the present, implemented under the guise of so-called 'Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion,' not only allow but champion illegal racial preferencing in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This kind of pernicious and wide-spread discrimination—packaged as 'anti-racism'—was allowed to flourish under the Biden Administration, but it will not be tolerated by this one," said Craig Trainor, acting assistant secretary for civil rights at the Education Department...

Full story at https://www.yahoo.com/news/education-department-announces-investigation-against-182020931.html.

From Inside Higher Ed: *America First Legal has called on the U.S. Department of Justice to investigate the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine for alleged racial discrimination, according to The Baltimore Banner. In a 133-page complaint filed Thursday, the conservative legal group, run by President Trump's deputy chief of staff, Stephen Miller, urged the DOJ to investigate Johns Hopkins "for its systemic, intentional, and ongoing discrimination within its School of Medicine on the basis of race, sex, ethnicity, national origin, and other impermissible, immutable characteristics under the pretext of 'diversity, equity, and inclusion' ('DEI') in open defiance" of civil rights laws, Supreme Court precedent and presidential executive orders...*

The America First Legal complaint singles out certain medical school divisions and programs for seeking to recruit a "diverse applicant pool," including residency programs in gynecology and obstetrics, emergency medicine, dermatology, anesthesiology and critical care. But the complaint leaves room for attacks beyond the medical school, noting that DEI practices "are part of a comprehensive, university-wide regime of racial engineering." ...

Full story at https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2025/07/21/america-first-legal-urges-doj-investigate-hopkins-dei.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:20 AM No comments:

Labels: diversity, George Mason U, Johns Hopkins, Michigan State University, politics

No Money

It's not clear why this information is coming out now, but here it is. From the Bruin: *UCLA has pulled out of its agreement with Santa Monica College to build affordable housing for students at both schools.*

SMC and UCLA planned to construct a building on SMC's Bundy Campus near the Santa Monica airport. It would have housed 750 students in apartment-style units, each with four bedrooms, two bathrooms and a kitchen, according to the Corsair, SMC's student newspaper.

However, a UCLA administrator told SMC in February that the university would no longer be able to participate in the project for financial reasons, said Don Girard, SMC's senior director of government relations and institutional communications...

Girard said seeing other UCs work on similar projects – including UC Riverside, which partnered with the Riverside Community College District to create apartment-style housing for nearly 1,600 students – [had] made him confident in the feasibility of

the SMC-UCLA plan... Girard said that while neither party signed an official contract, the project was seen as a "very serious process" – which included the SMC administrators touring UCLA Housing facilities and the consultation of attorneys...

Full story at https://dailybruin.com/2025/07/21/ucla-pulls-out-of-affordable-housing-discussion-with-santa-monica-college.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:10 AM No comments:

Labels: community colleges, UCLA

Tuesday, July 22, 2025

What's in a Name?

From the official UC-Berkeley News:
UC Berkeley outlines plans to account for The Bancroft Library's namesake

The campus will support an exhibit and lasting acknowledgment regarding the problematic writings and views of Hubert Howe Bancroft, for whom The Bancroft Library is named. The Bancroft Library will host an academic conference and also hire an engagement librarian to advance public education, outreach and instruction.

By Public Affairs

July 10, 2025

In June 2023, UC Berkeley leadership received a proposal to unname the campus's esteemed Bancroft Library, one of the largest special collections libraries in the United States. Citing the racist and nativist views of the library's namesake, Hubert Howe Bancroft, the proposal was the latest in a series of building unnaming requests on campus.

However, given that The Bancroft Library is not the name of a campus building, but rather the name of the library and multiple collections housed within the Doe Annex building, campus leadership determined in early 2024 that the proposal to unname The Bancroft Library required a special committee. Consequently, the Bancroft Library Reckoning Committee (BLRC) was created to consider and acknowledge the history of the library's namesake.

In spring 2024, the Office of the Chancellor, the UC Berkeley Library and the Division of Equity & Inclusion tasked the BLRC to review the writings of H.H. Bancroft and conduct listening sessions with library and campus constituents.

As part of its research and review process, the BLRC consulted a variety of primary and secondary sources by and about H.H. Bancroft, as well as the origins of The Bancroft Library. The BLRC also assembled citations for some of those materials into a guide, available on the Library website, and created a webpage to share information about its charge, publicize the listening sessions and seek input into the committee's deliberations via a public comment form.

The committee concluded its work earlier this year and submitted a detailed report to campus leaders in June. The report, available on the committee website, describes the group's process, findings and feedback it received. It also presented several options for what changes might include, as well as their potential implications.

Today (July 10), Chancellor Rich Lyons, Interim Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion Fabrizio Mejia, and University Librarian Suzanne Wones issued the following letter outlining their decision on the steps the campus and the library would take regarding H.H. Bancroft's legacy.

====

July 10, 2025

Decision regarding The Bancroft Library reckoning process

In June 2025, The Bancroft Library Reckoning Committee (BLRC) submitted its final report outlining its engagement with campus and community stakeholders in a reckoning process developed to consider and address the writings and views of Hubert Howe Bancroft, for whom the library is named. The report documents work from December 2023 to June 2025 to fulfill the committee's stated charge, which included:

Considering and acknowledging the history of the name of The Bancroft Library through listening sessions and a fact-finding review of key documents.

Compiling recommendations regarding possible actions.

Considering and weighing the risks and benefits of any proposed recommendations.

The BLRC was established in response to a proposal to unname The Bancroft Library, which documents H.H. Bancroft's racist and nativist views.

The committee considered a broad set of information, including primary and secondary sources by and about H.H. Bancroft and research on the origins of The Bancroft Library. The committee also engaged in five listening sessions with 86 participants total, two additional meetings with interested community groups, 48 comments received via Google forms, and 14 additional letters and submissions.

"As a public institution of higher education, the committee believes that a reckoning process provides opportunities for greater civic and community engagement and empowerment," the report states. "Deliberate and mindful reckoning may strike a balance between the calls for historical erasure of the library's name and those to keep it."

Upon careful consideration of the committee's report and accompanying documentation, in fulfillment of the committee's recommendation to embrace reparative actions, we are immediately announcing these commitments:

Community engagement: The Bancroft Library will add an outreach and community engagement librarian to its roster to increase its capacity to engage with public education, outreach, and instruction. This position will enable the library to do substantially more in its mission to connect with students, faculty, and the public. The librarian will increase access to and engagement with the library's collections, help foster a more accessible and welcoming environment, and coordinate public education around H.H. Bancroft and the history of the library. Time frame: 2026

Educational exhibition: The university will support an exhibition at The Bancroft Library and online that includes the origins and collecting history of the library; an exploration of the racist, nativist, and contradictory views and writings of H.H. Bancroft; and an acknowledgement of our responsibility to engage with and learn from the past. This will include the development of a permanent didactic. Time frame: Fall 2027

Academic symposium: The Bancroft Library will host an academic conference and ongoing community panels, forums, or symposia regarding the history of its name and including H.H. Bancroft's legacy and white supremacy in historical perspective. The conversations will include confronting the contradictions of honored political and cultural leaders of the past and how to best grapple with contemporary demands for social justice in light of historical forces in context. Time frame: 2028-2029

In its final report, the BLRC detailed many drawbacks to renaming The Bancroft Library and its collection. Based on these many drawbacks, the operational and fiscal challenges of renaming would prevent the library from serving its full archival role, including challenges for global users seeking "Bancroft Library" items that would no longer exist under that name. In addition, operational and fiscal challenges of an unnaming would prevent the library from taking proactive measures to address the harms created by the original writings of H.H. Bancroft.

After carefully weighing these and other factors, our considered judgment is to not change the name of The Bancroft Library.

Rather, we have committed to the above actions as a starting point in addressing and reckoning with H.H. Bancroft's bigotry, racism, and nativism, while acknowledging that the name and the legacy may have caused and may continue to cause harm. With this decision, we aim to invest in conversations and learning as an academic institution, helping to prepare our campus and our broader community to critically examine and act upon injustice now and into the future.

We acknowledge and thank the dedicated members of the BLRC for establishing a foundation from which we will continue to pursue restorative justice efforts on our campus.

Sincerely,

Richard K. Lyons, Chancellor

Fabrizio Mejia, Interim Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion

Suzanne Wones, University Librarian

====

Source: https://news.berkeley.edu/2025/07/10/uc-berkeley-outlines-plans-to-account-for-the-bancroft-librarys-namesake/.

====

It just may be that the political climate for name changing has itself changed. Or maybe the larger issue that Bishop George Berkeley, after whom the university and its host city are named, was a slave owner. UC-Berkeley changed the name of its law school over such issues but the central library is a campus-wide affair and changing its name would raise the issue of why the entire university shouldn't be renamed.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:30 AM No comments:

Labels: diversity, UC-Berkeley

Straws in the Wind - Part 47

From Journal: *In a significant financial development that has raised concerns across the academic community, the University of Arizona loses $59 million in federal funding, dealing a substantial blow to one of the nation's prominent public research institutions. The news has sent*

shockwaves throughout Arizona's higher education landscape, triggering urgent discussions about the future of research, staffing, and student support services.

The $59 million funding shortfall stems primarily from the loss of federal research grants and contracts that previously supported a wide range of scientific and technological initiatives. For years, the University of Arizona (UArizona) has been a hub for innovation, attracting federal funds for projects in space exploration, climate science, and biomedical research. The sudden reduction is being seen as a major disruption to the university's financial planning and academic mission.

University officials confirmed the loss earlier this week and emphasized that they are working closely with state leaders, faculty, and federal agencies to address the impact. The University of Arizona financial crisis adds to an already challenging period for many public universities nationwide, especially as institutions grapple with rising costs and shifting funding priorities...

It underscores the fragility of research ecosystems that rely on federal dollars and the cascading effects a single financial disruption can have on students, staff, and the institution's academic standing...

Full story at https://vocal.media/journal/university-of-arizona-loses-59-million-in-federal-funding.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:20 AM No comments:

Labels: politics, U of Arizona

Monday, July 21, 2025

Still Wondering

From time to time, we are reminded of the $80 million UCLA spent acquiring the campus of a defunct Catholic college in Palos Verdes. We are reminded of the difficulty in reaching it from Westwood, although it was "sold" to the Regents as a way of increasing enrollment capacity. Of course, given recent UC budgetary pressures stemming from Sacramento and Washington, we are reminded of all the nice things on which $80 million might otherwise have been spent.

Finally, the LA Times recently reminded us about the landslide area that developed not all that far from the defunct campus making homes uninhabitable:

After almost two years of unprecedented landslide movement that has upended life across much of the picturesque Portuguese Bend area of the Palos Verdes Peninsula, officials want to permanently ban new construction in the landslide zone. The proposed ordinance, which has drawn backlash from some property owners, would prohibit construction of new homes or additions in the area — even on vacant lots, of which many remain. However, it would permit repairs, restoration efforts or even the replacement of existing homes within a residence's established footprint. The measure will be considered next month by the Rancho Palos Verdes City Council...

Full story at https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-07-18/ban-homes-rancho-palos-verdes-slide-zone.

So, we're still wondering. It occurred to yours truly that maybe there are some lessons from history. So he looked for some and found this from the History Channel:

*"The Oxford Dictionary of American Political Slang" defines a "**boondoggle**" as "an extravagant and useless project," but behind the funny-sounding name is actual history. During the late 1920s and early 1930s, Boy Scouts at summer camps spent their days not only swimming and playing games but participating in the latest scouting craze in which boys braided and knotted colorful strands of plastic and leather to fashion lanyards, neckerchief slides and bracelets. According to the March 1930 issue of Scouting magazine, Eagle Scout Robert Link of Rochester, New York, coined the term for this new handicraft—"boondoggling."*

While scouts continued to craft "boondoggles" during the Great Depression, few Americans had heard of them until they suddenly became front-page news on April 4, 1935, when the New York Times reported that investigating city aldermen had discovered that the federal Works Progress Administration (WPA) had spent more than $3 million on training for unemployed white-collar workers that included instruction in ballet dancing, shadow puppetry and making boondoggles. Hundreds of unemployed teachers, who were paid $87 a month by the WPA, received two hours of boondoggling instruction as part of their training to establish recreational programs that showed children in poorer neighborhoods how to transform old cigar boxes, tin cans and other discarded materials into useful gadgets and ornamental crafts. "These projects are not carried on in Fifth Avenue," insisted WPA official Grace Goselin, "but in sections of the city where the children who are benefiting would otherwise be in the streets."

Republican critics of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal pounced on the frivolous-sounding boondoggling activities as indicative of what they saw as the WPA's wasteful spending, which included everything from operating a circus to eurhythmic dancing instruction. "It is a pretty good word," Roosevelt admitted in a January 1936 speech before adding, "If we can boondoggle our way out of the Depression, that word is going to be enshrined in the hearts

of Americans for many years to come." The word indeed became part of the American political lexicon, but not in the way Roosevelt had hoped. Ironically, an activity that was part of an effort to encourage children to reuse waste materials has become synonymous with waste itself.

Source: https://www.history.com/articles/where-did-the-word-boondoggle-come-from.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 6:46 AM No comments:

Labels: enrollment, politics, State Budget, UCLA

Basic Needs' Needs Met

From the Bruin: *The Good Clothes Good People Basic Needs Redistribution Center, which was slated for eviction in August 2024, has signed a lease agreement to retain its space until 2030. The center – housed in the Student Activities Center – offers school supplies, toiletries, mobility aids and clothes to students in need. The eviction notice arose due to a spacing conflict between GCGP, the group that runs the center, and the Scientific Diving Program, an organization that provides support to students who perform underwater research. The growing need for space for the Scientific Diving Program created uncertainty regarding the GCGP Basic Needs Redistribution Center's ability to stay in SAC, according to the memorandum of understanding, a document that outlines intentions between parties and the goals of an agreement...*

Full story at https://dailybruin.com/2025/07/13/basic-needs-redistribution-center-secures-lease-through-2030-avoids-eviction.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:30 AM No comments:

Labels: UCLA

Newer Posts Home Older Posts

Subscribe to: Posts (Atom)

Simple theme. Powered by Blogger.